

E 458

.3


.C52


Copy 2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00006141134





BATAVIA, OCTOBER 13, 1863.

FELLOW-CITIZENS:

You are assembled at a very critical and important period in the history of the country. Never before within your recollection and mine have interests so vast been at stake. In my judgment it is the duty now of every citizen to devote himself to National affairs. Questions of the most momentous character are crowding upon us with such rapidity that we are in danger of becoming bewildered and neglecting to discharge those duties which in a free government devolve upon the people, and which cannot now be neglected without endangering the Government itself.

All questions which have heretofore agitated parties and arrayed men upon opposite sides, as important as they have sometimes been regarded, sink into utter insignificance when compared with the issues of the present moment—issues upon the determination of which depend the future destinies of the country. The glorious Union, constructed by our fathers, and cemented with their blood, and the free institutions secured by it, are now trembling upon the verge of destruction, and can only be rescued and saved by the dispassionate and patriotic efforts of all the people. In our action as citizens, at this time, we should lay aside all our partisan feeling and prejudice. If the election involved only the question whether one class or men or another was to fill the offices, we might allow our fancy, and even our passions and prejudices, full play, without endangering constitutional and vital interests. It is of slight moment to the mass of the people whether one man or another is chosen to discharge the duties of a particular office. The State offices would be reasonably well filled by the election of either ticket in the field, and so far as the particular duties of such officers are concerned, it would matter but little which was elected. But I regard the election this fall as vitally important, on account of the influence it will have in restoring our distracted country to its original vigor and usefulness, and in determining the future policy of the government with reference to it, and it will be my purpose to ascertain what the real issue to be decided by the people is, and what questions every citizen should examine and determine for himself, before he deposits his ballot.

For two and a half years we have been engaged in a civil war for which history furnishes *no parallel*. When the war commenced and became an existing fact, I deemed it my duty to sustain the Government, and to the extent of my influence and means I have labored (with what success, I leave others to decide) to furnish the Government with all the men and money necessary to

crush the Rebellion and restore the legitimate authority of the nation. I occupy the same position to-day. So long as men are arrayed against the rightful authority of the Government, with arms in their hands, there is no other course to pursue but to meet them with force.

Whatever our views may be upon the causes which led to this terrible strife, and whatever blame we believe justly attaches to extreme men of the North, still the attempt forcibly to break down the authority of the Constitution over the whole country for fancied or real grievances, was an unlawful and criminal act which can not be justified or tolerated; while to admit the right of secession is to give up the supreme authority of the Government, even as to the powers expressly conferred upon it. Nor am I in favor of any peace based upon a separation. I will never consent to any but a country reunited and restored.

In expressing these views I but reiterate the sentiments of the Democratic party. At a convention recently held in Albany, composed of representatives of the highest character, ability, and patriotism from every Assembly District in the State, the following resolution was *unanimously* adopted:

Resolved, That we reaffirm the platform adopted by the Democratic Convention of 1862, namely:

First. That we will continue to render the Government our sincere and united support in the use of all legitimate means to suppress the rebellion and to restore the Union as it was, and to maintain the Constitution as it is—believing that that sacred instrument, founded in wisdom by our Fathers, clothes the constituted authorities with full power to accomplish such purpose.

Nor have the members of the Democratic party in their individual action been wanting in energy and effectiveness in supplying the calls of the Government. Whenever men were wanted, a full equal portion have been given from the ranks of that party. Every battle-field will attest the bravery and patriotism of members of the Democratic party.

Whenever money was called for, they have opened their coffers and furnished the required sum. Without receiving or desiring the patronage of the Administration, and without any selfish motives except such as result from a desire to enjoy the blessings of a free government, they have, at all times and under all circumstances, evinced a readiness to aid in carrying on the war and restoring the country.

I make these remarks merely to say, that upon this question there is no issue. You will find occasionally a man so wedded to

party and so blinded by passion or prejudice, as to denounce Democrats as copperheads and traitors; but I have found from considerable political experience, that epithets applied to an adversary never injure him, nor benefit those who employ them. The history of the world does not furnish a parallel the unity of action exhibited in the Northern States, in sustaining this Administration all its legitimate demands, and whenever impartial history shall be written of those who have participated in the conflict, its brightest page will contain the unselfish and patriotic action of those against whom these epithets are hurled.

Those who claim that there is any issue upon this question of maintaining the authority of the Government, are either thoroughly deceived, or are attempting to deceive others. Still more false and deceptive is the pretense which I see extensively put forth by public speakers and by the press, that there has been something in the action or sayings of Governor Seymour which ought to influence people in determining their action at the polls. I have examined several of their statements, and have failed to find a single specific charge made or a single act specified, and I therefore conclude that the general clamor on that subject is set up to hide the real questions that are at issue, and prevent, if possible, a consideration of them by the people. Governor Seymour quelled the riot in New-York before it became necessary to declare martial law, and he made an effort to obtain from the Administration at Washington, the privilege of furnishing men by volunteering instead of drafting, and he endeavored to secure to our State the credits to which it was entitled, by reason of having furnished an excess over Massachusetts and other States, on previous calls; and when a neighboring State was invaded, he promptly sent more soldiers to its defense than all the other Northern States combined, and confessedly contributed to, if he did not secure, the defeat of the rebel forces at Gettysburg.

If these acts were in controversy in this election, I should feel entirely confident in submitting them to the determination of the people; but I fully agree with the New-York *Herald*, when it reminded these gentlemen that Gov. Seymour was elected in 1862, and that we have entered upon a new campaign with issues belonging to it.

No, fellow-citizens! the questions for you to answer are of a different character entirely, and you should allow no false issues and subterfuges to interfere with their proper determination. What, then, are the issues of the present campaign?

When the war was commenced, the President solemnly pledged the country, that it should be prosecuted for the restoration of the Union and the maintenance of the Constitution. The theory proclaimed to the peo-

ple was, that the act of secession did not dissolve the Union, nor dis sever the lawful connection between the States seceding and the other States; that the rebellion only suspended for the time being the authority of the Government, and that when that was restored, the States could then rightfully exercise all the powers and privileges appertaining to them under the Constitution.

When our army was defeated at the battle of Bull Run, and driven back into the very streets of Washington, a Republican Congress, under the advice of a Republican President, placed upon the records of the country, a resolution (which passed almost unanimously) reiterating, in the most authentic and solemn manner, the pledge before given by the President, and declaring the purposes and objects of the war.

I will now read to you the resolution, and I beg that you will ponder its words and import:

"Resolved, That the present deplorable civil war has been brought upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States now in arms against the Constitutional Government, and in arms around the Capital, that in this national emergency, Congress, banishing all feelings of mere passion or sentiment, will recollect only its duty to the whole country; that this war is not waged on their part, in any spirit of oppression, for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, or purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of those States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease."

If the distinguished and lamented Sumnerian who penned and introduced this resolution had never done any other act worthy of public attention, the truthful and constitutional sentiments, and the glowing patriotic words embodied in it, with the motives which prompted its introduction, would have been sufficient to immortalize his name and cause his memory to be cherished to the latest posterity.

Under these pledges, a million and a half of our young men have left their homes and all the endearments of home and friends enlisted under the banner of their country. Untold millions of treasure have been sacrificed by the people. They have been willing to give every thing—to sacrifice every thing, and only demanded the restoration of their country and the preservation of our free institutions.

Are these pledges being fulfilled? Answer, No. On the contrary, they are being shamefully violated and guarded. No sooner are our armies engaged in the field of battle, giving up a restored country, than the clamor

abolitionism reveals itself, and the whole purpose and objects of the war are avowedly changed. It is now deliberately proclaimed that the war is not to be prosecuted "to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution," nor "to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired," but to destroy the Southern States and strike them out of existence—to subjugate their people, and desolate their country, and destroy their institutions. I do not make this charge against all the members of the Republican party. The great body of them I believe to be as honest and patriotic as any other class of citizens, and I believe that they have no wish to become aiders and abettors to this new programme which has been promulgated by their leaders; but it is expected that the force of party discipline will be sufficient to insure their support. We shall see.

I wish to be distinctly understood. I charge the radical and abolition leaders of the Republican party, who control its action and the action of the Administration, with the deliberate design to adopt and carry out a series of measures, the effect and object of which is to subvert the Union, and not to restore it—to overthrow the Constitution, and not to preserve it, and to carry on this war until these purposes have been accomplished, regardless of all consequences.

These measures consist in an attempt to subjugate the Southern States and reduce them to territories; and to absorb, centralize, and consolidate the rights and powers of the loyal States in the General Government. I make this charge in no spirit of party feeling or animosity, but with a solemn conviction of its truth, and of the duty of every citizen to sound the alarm before it is too late to prevent its consummation, and I would be the last to make it upon slight or unsatisfactory evidence. It is with feelings of sadness that I aver that the evidence to sustain this charge is overwhelming—a portion of which only I shall have time to present this evening. Charles Sumner has, perhaps, promulgated this scheme in the most authentic form. He occupies a prominent, if not a controlling influence in the Administration and the Republican party. In a recent article in the *Atlantic Monthly* he puts forth deliberately the proposition that Congress should assume jurisdiction over the seceded States, hold them as territories, establish provisional governments over them, or make their "admission or recognition depend upon the action of Congress." He says: "*The essential feature of the proposition is that Congress shall assume jurisdiction of the rebel States.*" Which he explains to mean that Congress "shall take and hold those States as conquered provinces or territories until the people will consent to ask to come into the Union with such Constitutions as

Congress shall dictate and accept, and intimates that when the people ask to come into the Union without slavery, Massachusetts may be willing to admit them. In the mean time Massachusetts would be willing to control the political power of the country, and to superintend generally the affairs of the world. Similar views have been expressed by the *Washington Chronicle*, which claims to be the official organ of the Administration, and the *Missouri Democrat*, the leading radical organ of the West, and other leading Administration organs.

Mr. Whiting, Solicitor of the War Department, in a recent opinion elaborately written, with the approbation, as we are bound to presume, of the head of that Department and the President himself, declares that when the Southern people cease fighting and lay down their arms, still they can not return to the Union, except upon such terms as Congress shall dictate, and that they should not be permitted to return until they consented to change their Constitutions and abolish slavery. This paragraph will give us the substance of his opinion:

"If the inhabitants of a large part of the Union have, by becoming public enemies, surrendered and annulled their former rights, the question arises, can they recover them? *Such rights can not be regained by reason of their having ceased to fight.* The character of a public enemy having once been stamped upon them by the laws of war, remains fixed until it shall have been by our consent removed."

The *New-York Tribune*, with its widely-extended circulation, is understood to be the New-York organ of the radicals, and it has scarcely attempted to conceal its opposition to the restoration of the Union. Even before the war broke out, the *Tribune* advocated the policy of allowing the seceded States to separate. It contained the following sentiment:

"Whenever it shall be clear that the great body of the Southern people have become conclusively alienated from the Union, and anxious to escape from it, WE WILL DO OUR BEST TO FORWARD THEIR VIEWS."

It now advocates the new policy of subjugation, and of carrying on the war for the abolition of slavery. Next to Wendell Phillips, Mr. Greeley is unquestionably the most open and determined disunionist in the country.

Thad. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, a leading member of the House of Representatives, and of course in the confidence of the Administration, said:

"This talk of restoring the Union as it was under the Constitution as it is, is one of the absurdities which I have heard repeated until I have become about sick of it. The Union can never be restored as it was. There are many things which render such an event

impossible. This Union never shall, with my consent, be restored under the Constitution as it is, with slavery to be protected by it."

M. F. Conway, a member of Congress from Kansas, and a leader in the Republican party, in a letter written in May last, stated:

"As to the Union, I would not give a cent for it unless it stood as a guarantee for freedom to every man, woman, and child within its entire jurisdiction. I consider the idea that every thing must be sacrificed to the Union utterly preposterous. What was the Union made for? That we should sacrifice ourselves to it? I, for one, would beg to be excused. *As things stand, I would sacrifice the Union to Freedom any morning before breakfast.*"

These sentiments are now being avowed and advocated in every section of the country.

Mr. HAMLIN, the Vice-President of the United States, in a recent speech, avowed the same sentiments.

At the recent Republican State Convention of Massachusetts, which renominated Governor Andrew, these disloyal sentiments were firmly and boldly promulgated. I will read a paragraph from the speech of Governor Boutwell on that occasion, which is a fair sample of all the others:

"He said that a State could only exist by the will of the people within its limits, and that by adopting ordinances of secession the rebellious States have given up their organization under the Union. But the Federal Government had a prior authority over the people and the territory of each State, which can only be restrained by force. Wherever our armies penetrate, that power is asserted, and the people must remain under the guardianship of the Federal authorities until unconditional Union men shall form a new State government, and ask for readmission to the Union. When that time should come, he would make it a condition precedent upon their readmission that they should come in as Free States."

To show how the sentiments of this convention are regarded by its friends, I will read a paragraph from the correspondent of the New-York *Tribune* in relation to it:

"In their admirable speeches, Wilson and Boutwell, Dana and Elliott, ranged themselves fully alongside of Phillips and Garrison, and the convention, with united and enthusiastic voices, said Amen!"

Who are Phillips and Garrison? The former an avowed disunionist, and the latter always declared that the Constitution was a *covenant with hell!* and the Massachusetts Republicans have confessedly ranged themselves alongside of them on this subject; and Massachusetts has to-day a more controlling influence over the Administration than all the other Northern States.

General Butler, in a recent speech in Pennsylvania, declared that he was opposed to the reconstruction of the Union as it was, and he

was ordered into that State to make these speeches under the full pay of a *Major-General*. These are only samples of an innumerable number of authoritative expressions, establishing the fact that a wide-spread conspiracy exists against the Union, and that an effort is to be made to use the Republican organization to carry it out. The Republican organization in this State is under the control of the revolutionists. At the recent State Convention held at Syracuse, an independent resolution was introduced, indorsing the emancipation proclamation. The principal speaker declared the object of this resolution in the following language:

"Sir, as a member of the old Republican party, I stand here to say, representing my constituents, that I believe the additional resolution is necessary, in order to avoid the possible construction of the resolutions already adopted, that we are ready to let these men come back into the Union with the institution of slavery guaranteed."

And although it was insisted that there were many members of the party who were not prepared to adopt this new policy, yet the radical majority adopted it.

To show that I do not misstate this abolition programme, I will read a paragraph or two from a speech recently made by MONTGOMERY BLAIR, a member of the Cabinet of Mr. Lincoln:

"But even while we are indulging these well founded hopes that our country is saved from destruction by the rebellion, we are menaced by the ambition of the ultra-abolitionists, which is equally despotic in its tendencies, and which, if successful, could not fail to be alike fatal to Republican institutions."

"The abolition programme assumes, on the contrary, that, because violence has trodden down State governments and State rights, they have ceased to exist; that a loyal people, in whom they still survive and have being, and to whom the United States stands pledged to guarantee them forever, must also have perished; and that a congress of the other States may step in and take absolute authority over the whole region as vacated States and Territories, and legislate for it, founding this new usurpation upon fictions as absurd as those on which the rebellion founds itself."

In the State of Missouri, the radical party have progressed further than in any other State, and have arrived almost at the brink of a war of extermination against all who do not subscribe to their fanatical heresies.

Frank Blair, who is a Republican member of Congress, and a Brigadier-General in General Grant's army, in a recent speech at St. Louis, felt himself called upon to denounce these radicals as enemies of their country. I will read a paragraph from his speech to show you how Republicans who are not abolitionists are becoming alarmed at the monstrous

strides toward usurpation and despotism which the leaders of the party are everywhere making :

"And yet these men, while they openly avow that they are conspiring against this Government, turn round and coolly inform you that they are the only *loyal* men in the State; and the men who came back grimed all over with powder from our battle-fields, where they have been endeavoring to uphold the banner of our country and maintain the laws and Constitution in the face of the open foe—these men, when they come back here, are denounced by these upstart factionists as *Copperheads*. (Laughter and applause.) There is not the slightest difference of opinion tolerated by them. If there is a variation of a hair's breadth—if a man attempts to say one single thing that differs with the plan which they have laid down for exterminating all these Southern States—why he is denounced at once; not as men with political differences are usually denounced—they do not call upon the people and let them know that his opinions are dangerous, unsound, and unwise, but they denounce him as a *Copperhead*, by which they mean he is a man against the Government of the United States, although he may be a man who has exposed his life over and over again in defense of that Government."

You will not fail to observe that the epithet of *Copperhead* is applied to all, whether Democrats or Republicans, who do not vote the abolition disunion ticket and support to the fullest extent the abolition radical doctrines.

Now I propose to call Thurlow Weed to the stand as a witness. He has had a full opportunity to form a correct judgment. He is undoubtedly as familiar with the political history of the country and with public men as any living man, and I will do him the justice to say that I believe he is at heart a friend to the Union, and desires to see it restored. I will give you his words, deliberately written :

"I desire to make this record : If it comes to be understood that the views and policy of Messrs. Sumner, Greeley, Wendell Phillips, Ward Beecher, etc., etc., obtain in the conduct of the war, it will result in the destruction of our Government and Union, and a triumph of rebellion and slavery."

How Mr. Weed can continue even a nominal connection with an organization controlled by men whom he denounces as enemies of the country, I am at loss to comprehend. But we know that he is right in the opinion I have read. You and I and every man knows that ten or twelve States can only be held in subjection by military despotism, and that the exercise of this despotism over the subjugated States, will render it a necessity to exercise military power over the other States. It will require a large standing army and a ruinous system of taxation. The idea of enjoying the institutions of our fathers—the

liberty they fought for and bequeathed to us, under a Government holding one-third of its people in military subjugation, is too absurd to require illustration. When this doctrine shall prevail, and subjugation be consummated, we shall have seen the last day of American freedom. But it is sometimes said that Mr. Lincoln has not avowed himself in favor of this scheme, and although all the appliances of party machinery are in favor of it, yet he may be opposed to it. Well, I have no disposition to speak harshly of Mr. Lincoln, but the truth should be told. Mr. Lincoln is a negative man. He is operated upon. He moves by outward pressure, and not by internal power. It was said that he was opposed to the emancipation proclamation; indeed he said so himself, and yet he issued it upon radical pressure. Gov. Andrew declared that the highways of Massachusetts would swarm with soldiers if that was issued, and Greeley declared that 900,000 men would rush to the field with two muskets each, and although they procured the proclamation by these means, not one Greeley man has been known to have even one musket, and not a swarm in a Massachusetts highway has been seen except when the conscripts were going to swear to their physical inability to perform military duty. The President frankly told a committee of Border State men that he could not yield to their wishes lest he should lose the support of the radicals; and I assert that in every single instance where the test has been made, the radical or abolition wing of the party has prevailed with the President.

They demanded the removal of McClellan after the peninsular campaign, and it was done. When the army of the Potomac were driven back upon Washington, defeated and demoralized, and the Capitol was in imminent danger, he was restored, but after he had fought and won a brilliant victory with undisciplined and defeated troops at Antietam and drove the invaders from Maryland, and when in full march and in face of the enemy, upon the demand of the radicals, he was again removed, and what is most significant, the removal was made on the morning after the election in New-York in 1862, when the Democratic party was triumphant.

The radicals demanded a sweeping confiscation act, which Senator Collamer, of Vermont, and other Republican Senators declared unconstitutional, and they got it.

They demanded emancipation and they got it.

When citizens from Louisiana asked the privilege of electing officers under the State constitution, the President substantially declined to allow it, intimating that their constitution would be changed or altered.

The citizens of North-Carolina and other seceded States have recently evinced a disposition to return to the Union and enjoy the benefits of their own Constitution, under the

protection of the Government. Has there been any disposition on the part of the President to allow them to do so? Not the slightest. I have not the slightest doubt but large numbers of the people of the South would rejoice to assume again their position in the Union. Are they encouraged to do so? So far from it, Mr. Lincoln informs them and the rest of mankind, that his proclamation is "valid or invalid." It certainly does not require the President to issue an official document to make a man of ordinary comprehension understand that the proclamation, like every other instrument, is *either valid or invalid*. But the people of North-Carolina and other States have become tired of the tyranny exercised over them, and are longing to return to their allegiance to the Union, and with uplifted hands and anxious hearts, they desire to know of Mr. Lincoln whether he regards the proclamation as of any force or power beyond the actual duration of the war. They wish to know how his administration regard it. What they intend to claim. For the people of these States know, as we all do, that courts even are influenced by outside pressure and partisan clamor, and they ask Mr. Lincoln, I repeat, to say what course he intends to pursue, and the only response is: "It is either valid or invalid." What encouragement have the people of the seceded States to attempt even to return to the Union? As matters now stand, there is confiscation to take all their property, emancipation to take their negroes, a test oath to prevent their holding office in the Union, and a treason act to hang them. With these alternatives, I do not think that many will voluntarily return.

These facts furnish conclusive evidence to my mind that Mr. Lincoln either entertains these views of subjugation, or that he is under the control of those who do. There are but two modes of dealing with the fanatics. You must either yield to their views and wishes in every point, or be denounced by them, and as Mr. Lincoln has thus far not dared to disagree with them, and has thus far yielded in the end to all their demands, I conclude that he will continue to do so.

In addition to a subjugation of the Southern States, it is designed, as I have already stated, to consolidate all the power of the loyal States in the General Government, and in this scheme Mr. Lincoln has been a prominent actor. I have been amazed at the strides toward consolidated power made by this administration.

The conscription act authorizes the exercise of power directly from the Government to the individual, overlooking State authority and individual influence. The banking scheme is another and far more dangerous exercise of power. The conscription act, however unwise as a policy, may be technically constitutional under the power "to raise armies," but the banking law has no warrant in the Constitution. Nor is it pretended to be a "war

measure," or that any "war necessity" existed for it. On the contrary, it was evidently the intention, under the pressure of the times, to fasten this scheme upon the country as a permanent institution. It is designed to wipe out all State banks and center in Washington all the monied interests of the Nation. The people of the United States struggled long under the leadership of that great and good man, Gen. Jackson, to eradicate the United States Bank, because it was deemed dangerous to our free institutions to give the Government control of the monetary interests of the nation, but this scheme is far worse than that. This destroys State banks, and places all banking operations under control of the officers of the government not only, but subjects the business of the country to the fitful and uncertain policy of those who happen to be in power. Besides, it will depreciate the stocks of the several States which now form the basis of banking, and throw upon the people an additional burden of hundreds of millions. Moreover, it establishes a precedent of the most dangerous character. If these institutions can be thus obliterated by National legislation, every other State institution may be. Our system of internal improvement, our schools, in short, every State interest, may become absorbed in the general Government. Federalism of the olden time would blush at such centralism as is now contended for.

But the crowning act of infamy is the late suspension of the *Habeas Corpus*. Heretofore we have rested secure under the shield of the Constitution and the protection of the laws. We could gather around our hearthstones in security, and retire at night confident that the unseen but potent shield would guard and protect us and our families and homes from invasion and violence. With a single stroke of the pen this writ of protection to personal liberty has been suspended, and for the time being obliterated. And why has it been done? No man can tell us a reason—no man has attempted to give a reason for it. I have inquired of officials, high and low, why this extraordinary act has been done, and no explanation has been or could be given. There was no reason for it. It was an unnecessary act of despotism. The courts, so far from evincing a disposition to thwart the action of the Government, have been over-cautious, and the State Judges, so far as my observations have extended, have fallen far short of maintaining State authority and individual liberty in a laudable desire not to obstruct the action of the Government in the present crisis.

But we are told that no *loyal man* will be injured. No *loyal man* injured! Who is to decide on my loyalty or yours? Why, the officer who makes the arrest, and if, in his opinion, we have interfered in word, act, or deed with the military or naval service, he is authorized to act as judge, jury, and execu-

tioner. It is enough if men *may* be injured. What is a government worth which does not furnish protection to its people? They have a right to demand a fixed and affirmative rule of protection, and will not tolerate a system which places them at the mercy of petty officials.

But *loyal* people are injured and outraged every day by the suspension of this writ. Repeated instances have taken place within a few days of arrests of persons as deserters who have either never been enlisted or been honorably discharged, and they have been dragged into a military camp and confined for days and weeks. I know of one instance where a man who had been discharged was arrested three different times by different officers and taken into the army, and each time the officer received his reward. If your own son who had been in the army, and, it may be, passed through all the battles of the Potomac, should, after being honorably discharged, be arrested as a deserter, you would think that he ought to have an opportunity to bring the question before a court. The writ of *habeas corpus* simply allows a party to go into court and inquire why he is restrained from his liberty. If good cause is shown, he is remanded to custody; if not, he is discharged. A recruiting officer may enlist your boy, fourteen years of age, in violation of an act of Congress, and you have no civil remedy. There is no outrage upon personal liberty which may not be committed. The country literally swarms with officers of the Government, paid by taxation, and outrages are being and will be perpetrated.

I have called your attention, fellow-citizens, to these acts and schemes for the purpose of inducing you to examine the subject, and see where we are drifting. If we change our Union, tell me what kind of a Union we shall have? If we change the essential features of our Government, who can tell what our Government will be? If we override our Constitution, who is wise enough to tell us what will be substituted? If we strike ten from the bright galaxy of stars composing our Union, what power will ever restore them or give them vital action? If we commence to change our institutions, there will be no end but anarchy and despotism.

You have often heard it said, that free government was an experiment. The experiment consists in determining whether a people will permanently abide by the laws of a written constitution. In quiet and prosperous times, we would scarcely need a constitution at all. It is when adversity comes upon us—when temptation allures or necessity exists, that restrictions in organic laws are in danger of being violated. Written constitutions are of no value; they are worse than useless, except they are sufficient to restrain acts which we desire to perform.

The controlling influences of the Republican party have inaugurated all these meas-

ures and carried them through, and have besides infused into the whole body of the Republican leaders the poison of Abolitionism. They control the party and the Administration. In every State where the election has resulted in favor of the Republicans, the result has been claimed as a verdict in favor of the subjugation and consolidation policy, and, if this State should so result, it would be used as a tremendous "pressure" upon Mr. Lincoln and his administration in the same direction.

Now, fellow-citizens, I say that any man who is in favor of protracting this war one day beyond the time when the Union may be restored, is an enemy to his country. I have heard it said that the war has brought prosperity with it; but it is not a legitimate and permanent prosperity. We are in a state of unnatural exhilaration which will ultimately prove fatal to every business interest. The drunken man, reeling and staggering through the streets, imagines himself the richest man in the world, but when the artificial stimulus is gone he sinks into degradation and despair, and this is our condition now. By artificial means the business interests of the country are greatly inflated, but it will as certainly become depressed as that effect will follow cause.

A legalized irredeemable paper currency is the greatest curse which can afflict a people. It enriches the few, but it impoverishes the many. It pampers the idle, while it degrades the industrious, and the apparent benefits which it confers are most delusive and deceptive.

I am opposed to this whole scheme, because I know it will result in the destruction of the Union and the overthrow of the Constitution.

Subjugation, in my judgment, is impossible, and its attempt will procrastinate the war interminably. If it is possible, it is not desirable, because it would necessarily inaugurate despotism.

Whilst we will sacrifice all for the Union, we can not afford to continue this war for the visionary purpose of abolishing slavery, or the criminal purpose of experimenting for a change in our institutions.

No man in this administration dares to inform us what the amount of our present indebtedness is. The reports of the Secretary of the Treasury are utterly unsatisfactory on this point. I have endeavored from all the light I can obtain to estimate this indebtedness, and I maintain the opinion that if this war shall close during the present fiscal year, it will not be less than three thousand millions of dollars! I think it will be more, but I am sure it can not be less. I arrive at this conclusion from the known expenses of maintaining men in the field—from the reports of the Treasury Department—the estimates of Mr. Spaulding, Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the last House of Repre-

representatives, and the authorized statements emanating from Washington from time to time during the war.

Of this sum New-York would be liable, if the Union was restored with the original wealth of the seceded States, for about one ninth, or more than \$330,000,000! the annual interest on which is nearly twenty millions of dollars.

This indebtedness is about one quarter of all the taxable property of the country before the war. The proportion of this debt for the county of Genesee is about four millions of dollars, the interest on which is two hundred and forty thousand dollars, which you will be required to pay annually in some form. In fact, the amount to be paid by New-York will be much larger, because the property in the South has been largely reduced during the war. I have estimated at the lowest figure.

Besides, after the war has ceased, the annual expenses of the Government cannot be less than \$150,000,000. Assuming that we may realize \$50,000,000 by Customs, it will leave two hundred millions to be raised by taxation, and if New-York pays only one ninth, it will add more than ten millions to the annual tax of the State, so that for interest alone upon our portion of the National debt, and of our portion of the annual expenses we shall be obliged to pay more than thirty millions annually, which is equal to our whole State debt, and this sum, remember, is in addition to State, County, and Municipal taxes.

The national debt of England is only about \$3,400,000,000, and their taxable property is more than double the amount of ours, while their rate of interest upon the public debt is only three per cent, or half the amount of ours; so that while our debt is nominally \$400,000,000 less than theirs, it is practically in its burdens upon the nation much larger.

I do not speak of these things because we should falter in the least to make this sacrifice, and much more, if necessary, to restore the Union, but shall we, ought we to do it, to further the views of the Abolitionists?

The burden of all taxation falls upon labor. The farmer, mechanic, and laboring men, and all professional men suffer heavily, while taxation grinds the poor to the earth. What is it that literally enslaves one half the population of Great Britain and compels them to work from early morn till late at night for a scanty subsistence? They have a fine climate, good soil, and excel in manufactures, and they boast of a free constitution. Why, then, this degradation? It is because of the oppressive taxes which fall upon the back of labor. Heretofore, in this country, we have been comparatively free from taxation, and labor has received its reward and had the benefit of it.

If you take from the laboring man a por-

tion of his earnings, which are necessary for the comfortable support of himself and family, you detract from his independence as a man and a citizen, and, therefore, the mock philanthropists, in their fruitless efforts to liberate three millions of black slaves, will make ten millions of white slaves, and entail upon posterity degradation, misery, and crime.

I beg that you will bear in mind, also, that by an act of Congress the stocks of the Government are made exempt from all taxation. One quarter of all taxable property is thus withdrawn from liability, and its burden cast upon the remainder. Those who have money can invest it in Government securities, and then escape all the burdens of Government, while the farmer's lands and the home of the mechanic and laboring man must bear the burden which belongs to their more fortunate neighbor.

But I have already detained you too long, and I can not pursue the subject further.

I ask you to determine at the ballot-box, whether your influence shall be thrown in favor of this monstrous scheme of 'subjugation and consolidation. I put this question not only to Democrats and conservative men, but to those who have heretofore acted with the Republicans; and I am gratified to see many of them here to-night. Are you willing, in behalf of yourselves and your families, to try this new experiment? Are you in favor of carrying on this war for the visionary purpose of abolishing slavery; when its effect will certainly be to destroy the free institutions under which you have enjoyed so many blessings? Shall the influence of New-York be thrown in the scale of subjugation and disunion? Before you deposit your ballot for this destructive policy, consult your wives and children. Tell them that we have so far overcome the military power of the rebel States that an opportunity is afforded, by conciliation with the Union men of the South, to restore the old Union and maintain the Constitution, but that it is now proposed by the radical leaders to go farther, and carry on the war for the ostensible purpose of abolishing slavery, but really with the design of changing the whole character of the Government itself. Tell them that one quarter of all you possess is already mortgaged for the expenses of the war, and that this new scheme will not only encumber your property to a much greater extent, but will be a never-ending burden upon the industry and energies—nay, upon the very bones and muscles of your children!

I feel an abiding confidence that New-York will cast her imperial influence in the right direction. Whatever other States may do, our own Empire State will stand firm and true. Let others yield if they will, but let us stand firm, and we shall have the proud consolation of having rescued our beloved land from its enemies at the South and its enemies at the North.

